

- conscious and explicit dialogue with the predominant movements of critical art of their period.
- 20 [36] Frazer Ward, 'The Haunted Museum: Institutional Critique and Publicity', *October*, 73 (Summer 1995) 83.
- 21 [38] The tape is called this in the descriptive list of Rosler's works found in *Martha Rosler: Positions in the Life World*, ed. Catherine de Zegher (Birmingham, England: Ikon Gallery/Vienna: Generali Foundation, 1998).
- 22 [40] Rosler in *Martha Rosler: Positions in the Life World*, 31.
- 23 [44] Fredric Jameson, 'Periodizing the 1960s', in *The Sixties without Apology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984) 79. Additionally, Martha Rosler has said of her own work: 'Everything I have ever done I've thought of "as if": Every single thing I have offered to the public has been offered as a suggestion of a work ... which is that my work is a sketch, a line of thinking, a possibility.' ('a Conversation with Martha Rosler', in *Martha Rosler: Positions in the Life World*, 31).
- 24 [45] For more on the importance of privacy, see Drucilla Cornell, *At the Heart of Freedom: Feminism, Sex and Equality* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998). [...]
- 25 [47] Drucilla Cornell, *At the Heart of Freedom*, op. cit., 24.

Helen Molesworth, extracts from 'House Work and Art Work', *October*, no. 92 (Winter 2000) 75–88; 90–6.

Joseph Kosuth

The Artist as Anthropologist//1975

Part II. Theory as Praxis: A Role for an 'Anthropologized Art'

'The highest wisdom would be to understand that every fact is already a theory.'
– Goethe

1. The artist perpetuates his culture by maintaining certain features of it by 'using' them. The artist is a model of the anthropologist *engaged*. It is the implosion Mel Ramsden speaks of, an implosion of a reconstituted socio-culturally mediated overview.¹ In the sense that it is a theory, it is an overview; yet because it is not a detached overview but rather a socially mediating activity, it is engaged, and it is praxis. It is in this sense that one speaks of the artist-as-anthropologist's *theory* as praxis. There obviously are structural similarities between an 'anthropologized art' and philosophy in their relationship with society (they both depict it – making the social reality conceivable) yet art is manifested in praxis; it 'depicts' *while* it alters society.² And its growth as a

cultural reality is necessitated by a dialectical relationship with the activity's historicity (cultural memory) and the social fabric of present-day reality. [...]

7. Because the anthropologist is outside of the culture which he studies he is not a part of the community. This means whatever effect he has on the people he is studying is similar to the effect of an act of nature. He is not part of the social matrix. Whereas the artist, as anthropologist, is operating within the same socio-cultural context from which he evolved. He is totally immersed, and has a social impact. His activities embody the culture. Now one might ask, why not have the anthropologist, as a professional, 'anthropologize' his own society? Precisely because he is an anthropologist. Anthropology, as it is popularly conceived, is a science. The scientist, as a professional, is *dis-engaged*.³ Thus it is the nature of anthropology that makes anthropologizing one's own society difficult and probably impossible in terms of the task I am suggesting here. The role I am suggesting for art in this context is based on the difference between the very basis of the two activities – what they mean as human activities. It is the pervasiveness of 'artistic-like' activity in human society – past or present, primitive or modern, which forces us to consider closely the nature of art. [...]

9. Artistic activity consists of cultural fluency. When one talks of the artist as an anthropologist one is talking of acquiring the kinds of tools that the anthropologist has acquired – in so far as the anthropologist is concerned with trying to obtain fluency in another culture. But the artist attempts to obtain fluency in his *own* culture. For the artist, obtaining cultural fluency is a dialectical process which, simply put, consists of attempting to affect the culture while he is simultaneously learning from (and seeking the acceptance of) that same culture which is affecting him. The artist's success is understood in terms of his praxis. Art *means* praxis, so any art activity, including 'theoretical art' activity, is praxiological. The reason why one has traditionally not considered the art historian or critic as artist is that because of Modernism (Scientism) the critic and art historian have always maintained a position outside of praxis (the attempt to find objectivity has necessitated that) but in so doing they made culture *nature*. This is one reason why artists have always felt alienated from art historians and critics. Anthropologists have always attempted to discuss other cultures (that is, become fluent in other cultures) and translate that understanding into sensical forms which are understandable to the culture in which they are located (the 'ethnic' problem). As we said, the anthropologist has always had the problem of being outside of the culture which he is studying. Now what may be interesting about the artist-as-anthropologist is that the artist's activity is not *outside*, but a mapping of an internalizing cultural activity in his own society. The artist-as-

anthropologist may be able to accomplish what the anthropologist has always failed at. A non-static 'depiction' of art's (and thereby culture's) operational infrastructure is the aim of an anthropologized art. The hope for this understanding of the human condition is not in the search for a religio-scientific 'truth', but rather to utilize the state of our constituted interaction. [...]

- 1 The term 'implosion' was originally introduced into our conversation by Michael Baldwin. I refer here to its use by Mel Ramsden in 'On Practice', this issue.
- 2 This notion of an 'anthropologized art' is one I began working on over three years ago – a point at which I had been studying anthropology for only a year, and my model of an anthropologist was a fairly academic one.
That model has continually changed, but not as much as it has in the past year through my studies with Bob Scholte and Stanley Diamond (at the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research). While their influence is strongly felt, I obviously take full responsibility for the use (or misuse) of their material within my discussion here.
- 3 [footnote 5 in source] I must point out here that the Marxist anthropology of Diamond and Scholte is not included in this generalization. Indeed, due to the alternative anthropological tradition in which they see themselves, their role as anthropologists *necessitates* that they be 'engaged'. It is a consideration of their work, and what it has to say about the *limits* of anthropology (and the study of culture) which has allowed me a further elucidation of my notion of the 'artist-as-anthropologist'.

Joseph Kosuth, extract from 'The Artist as Anthropologist', *The Fox*, no. 1 (New York, 1975); reprinted in Kosuth, *Art after Philosophy and After: Selected Writings 1966–1990* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1991) 117–24.

Stephen Willats The Lurky Place//1978

Not far from the busy shopping centre of Hayes in West London, there exists a large, seemingly abandoned, area of land known to the residents of surrounding housing estates as the 'Lurky Place'. Completely hemmed in by various manifestations of institutional society, the Lurky Place is a waste land, isolated and contained. It is this symbolic separation from an institutionalized society that gives the Lurky Place its value for local inhabitants. While the Lurky Place is, of course, actually dependent on society for its existence, the local inhabitants

view it as being outside the norms and stereotypes of everyday life. It has become a territory for pursuits which cannot be undertaken within institutional society, and, as such, is a symbol of a consciousness counter to the dominant authoritative consciousness.

In the work *The Lurky Place*, the waste land is seen as a vehicle for a 'counter-consciousness', which takes the form of self-determined behaviours. The determinism of the dominant culture is inferred in the work by the objects transported into the 'Lurky Place' by people engaging in various pursuits. I photographed these items in situ and used them as triggers for making connections back into the institutionalized society from which they originated and from which they have been freed. The manufacture of an item, and its decomposition in the Lurky Place represent two totally different value structures which – while existing in a state of alienation from each other – are nevertheless linked by a linear path of events through time. The movement of an item from location to location represents a point of change in the way that item's function is perceived. In the linear system: A. Factory, B. Home, C. Lurky Place, three points are represented which transform the perception of an item's function. There can therefore be quite a clear distinction between an item's assumed function in manufacture and its subsequent function in the Lurky Place. The transportation of an item into the Lurky Place represents a fundamental point of transformation. Two types of transformation occur: 1. an article is given a use other than that intended at its manufacture; and 2. the intended use of certain items can only be fulfilled by being freed from the constraining conventions of everyday life. In both cases, the transformation of the item also frees the persons who vest in it changes of function. For these persons, the article becomes an agent for manifesting a consciousness counter to that of the institutional society from which they are escaping. The mundane routines of the day are relieved by pursuits in the Lurky Place, the key to which lies in the transportation of items.

The work is divided into a sequence of four interrelated areas, each of which centres on a point of transformation in the reality of an individual, symbolically represented. This sequence is as follows: education, home, work, culture.

Each state is divided into two parts. The top relates the transported items back to institutional society, represented in the work by such manifestations as a school, tower block, factory and car dump, all located on the edge of the Lurky Place. The bottom part presents the viewer with a problem question in the form of a text relating to the different ways the symbolic individual is involved in various behaviours. A concept frame in both areas of each state holds various representations of the symbolic individual and transported items as variables or cues, related to the problem question. Thus the viewer is presented with a puzzle which can only be solved by entering into the encoded structure of *The Lurky*